



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PROGRESS OF THE WORLD

An epidemic of "outlaw" strikes has been sweeping the country, chiefly begun without warning and without any expressed reason, and generally aimed at causing as much inconvenience, loss and suffering as possible, not to the employers or to capitalists but to the public. They appear to have been planned and incited by some hidden agency, all meetings and deliberations being in secret, and the strikers themselves generally declaring that they did not know who had ordered them out, or why it had been done. They were also begun contrary to the wishes of the chief bodies of "organized labor," the Railroad Brotherhoods and the American Federation of Labor, and indeed to have been directed against them as much as against the employers. Three things were, however, from the first unmistakable. One was, that it was a deplorable mistake to drop the anti-strike provision from the new Railroad law. Even the Railroad Brotherhoods which formerly opposed those provisions recognized that fact, and clamored for the enforcement of some law against the "outlaw" strikers; apparently on the naïve theory that they themselves should be free to strike, but that nobody else should, under penalty. The second point was, that by their years of teaching men the right to strike and the right to oppose constituted authorities the Brotherhoods and the Federation played the part of Frankenstein and incited the men to strike, in the last resort, against themselves. The third, suggested by the demands of the "outlaws" for Government ownership of utilities and industries, was the most serious of all. By its readiness to yield to the threat of strikes and to grant all the demands of the men, the Administration seems to have persuaded certain classes of workmen that they can get more from Government ownership than from private ownership. Their demand for Government ownership is thus based

solely upon the sordid principle that the Government is an "easy mark"; for which unflattering estimate of it the Administration is itself responsible. It may be, however, that the "outlaw" strikes, detestable and disastrous as they have been, will serve the useful purpose of causing an all around "showdown," and of expediting a determination of the question whether the great public utilities and industries of this country are to be dominated by a faction for its selfish and sordid pleasure or are to be operated subject to the common law for the welfare of the whole people.

The attempted revolution in Germany happily failed. However faulty the present Government may be, the success of the revolutionists would have been the proverbial leap from the frying-pan into the fire. It served, meantime, two useful purposes. It revealed to the world the low morale of the German nation, and it gave the German Government opportunity to exercise and to exhibit the duplicity and bad faith which seem inseparable from it. The not unnatural suspicion that the whole revolt was a piece of collusion may have been unfounded. But there can be no question that the Berlin Government on being restored tried to trade upon the disturbed condition of the country so as to evade the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, particularly in its pretense of dealing with the Spartacan riots in the Ruhr region. The overwhelming weight of credible testimony was to the effect that there was not the slightest need of sending German armies thither, and we must assume that they were sent for the chief if not the sole sake of violating the treaty under the pretext of a necessity which did not exist.

This Hunnish trickery had the effect of rousing France to protest and to something more than verbal protest; and the supremely significant thing was that France did so at her own initiative and alone. It has been intimated that neither our President, who by right had nothing to say about it, nor the British Government, which has shown an unfortunate tendency to disagree with its great Ally, approved M. Millerand's course. So much the worse for them, for M. Millerand—and Marshal Foch—were right. Germany's conduct was unquestionably a gross violation of the treaty, and it was one which was directly and particularly menacing—and in all probability was meant to be menacing

—to France. To pretend that France should have done nothing about it without the counsel and cooperation of the other Powers would be equivalent to saying that a man should not put out a fire which he caught an incendiary kindling at the side of his house until he had called the neighbors together to discuss what kind of an extinguisher should be used. Some have foolishly charged that France acted as she did because she was excited and “rattled.” On the contrary, she did so because she was quite cool, collected and resolute.

The demand for a bonus for all who served in the Great War continues to be pressed, and to be opposed, both within and without the ranks of the American Legion. It is difficult to avoid the impression that some of the advocates of such a scheme, especially outside of the Legion, are moved by political considerations. It is also difficult to defend the proposition in its present form even on the ground of pecuniary justice to the men. The argument is that the men were taken away from profitable occupations to serve the Government at much lower wages, and that they should be remunerated for the money loss which they thus sustained; and it is added that many of them have been unable to get employment again at as good wages as before, and that they are sorely in need of the bonus to enable them to make a fresh start in business. Now that is doubtless true in some cases, but in others it is not true. Some men got better pay in the army than they had been getting before they entered it. Some are more prosperous now than they were before the war. While any man could of course make use of a bonus, many of them are not really in need of it. To pay an equal bonus to all, regardless of these conditions, would therefore be inequitable. Years ago a prominent Member of Congress incurred the ridicule of his opponents as “Horizontal Bill” because he advocated a “horizontal reduction” of all tariff rates by the same percentage, entirely regardless of the effect upon revenue or protection. The same objection applies to the paying of a flat rate bonus to all soldiers, unless, of course, it is based upon an entirely different ground from that generally urged. Meanwhile it is interesting to observe that disapproval of the whole scheme is rapidly increasing within the ranks of the Legion. Local organizations of the Legion in various parts

of the country have adopted resolutions against it and are conducting a systematic and vigorous campaign against it. They see that scores of thousands of more or less disabled soldiers are suffering piteously for lack of the vocational training which the Government promised them but has not yet given them; that the Army and Navy are suffering depletion and demoralization because of the insufficient pay of the officers; and that the whole nation is overburdened with war taxation. In these circumstances they regard with disfavor a proposal which would either greatly increase taxation or add another billion or two to the national debt. That attitude, to employ a time-worn phrase, is worthy of the best traditions of the American Army and Navy.

A real epoch in higher education has been marked by the action of Oxford University in dropping compulsory Greek from its entrance requirements. This was effected after long agitation and dispute, by a vote which while far from unanimous was sufficiently decisive to banish all thoughts of reconsideration or reversal. And since Oxford has done this, what other institution in the world can be counted upon to hold out for what Mr. Charles Francis Adams many years ago called a "College Feticch"? The incident is the more noteworthy because during the years of the Great War there has been in many quarters a revival of devotion to the Classics and other "Humanities," on the by no means weak or unworthy ground that it was the persistence of Great Britain and France in those studies that gave those nations a so much higher moral, ethical and spiritual tone than that of Germany, which was given so largely to the material sciences. Since there is no reason to suspect that Oxford means to relapse into Hunnishness, we must suppose that it has confidence that the abolition of compulsory Greek will not diminish but will on the contrary actually increase the study of that language and literature. Such, indeed, was the case in France, less than a score of years ago. Both Greek and Latin were stricken from the required list for the baccalaureate degree. For a time there was a great falling off from the pursuit of those studies. But then a storm of complaints and protests arose, not from the Classicists but from the Scientists. Engineers, chemists and other practitioners and teachers of the material sciences complained that their pupils and apprentices, not hav-

ing studied the classics, were far less efficient than before. Teachers of French and other modern languages made the same complaint of their pupils; not having studied Greek and Latin, they could not satisfactorily master French and English. So a demand arose from the technical and scientific schools that their pupils should be thoroughly versed in the classics. There was no change in the law, but the parents took the matter in hand, and compelled their children to elect the classics, with the result that in a short time those studies were more generally and certainly more thoroughly pursued than when they had been on the compulsory list. It will be interesting to see if something of the sort happens in England.

The investigation into the conduct of the Navy during the war, which was brought about by Admiral Sims, seems to be approaching irresistibly the conclusion that at our entry into the war, despite our two years' warning, the Navy was disgracefully unprepared, and that after our entry it suffered seriously from lack of plans of campaign, and from hesitancy and delay in making vital decisions. Some officers of high rank, it is true, have expressed the opinion that it was well prepared, even as well prepared as that of Great Britain. We have no doubt that some of the ships were in perfect trim, and that a large proportion of the officers and men were equal in efficiency to any in the world. Against these opinions of readiness must be set, however, the facts of record that many of the ships required weeks or months to fit them for service, that the supply of ammunition was altogether inadequate, and that the personnel was numerically far below even a peace basis. This last circumstance, one of the most serious of all, appears to have been chargeable directly to the Secretary of the Navy, who had persistently discouraged any increase of the enlisted personnel. Some officers have also insisted that suitable plans of campaign were in existence at the beginning of the war; but if so, they certainly seem to have been kept from the knowledge of two of the officers most concerned with them, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the chief liaison officer in London. Responsibility for these melancholy conditions must rest upon the Secretary of the Navy, excepting in so far as it rests upon the President himself. Hitherto

"Sir Josephus" has been commonly regarded as a joke. He now seems to have come perilously near to being a disaster.

The Bolsheviks are making desperate efforts to secure recognition, or even the quasi-recognition implied in the resumption of trade, and are making all sorts of promises, or offers of promises, to be good in a dozen different ways, if the Powers will only be good to them. These overtures should deceive nobody. They are simply a counsel of despair. Soviet Russia is economically a ghastly failure, and is now trembling upon the verge of utter collapse. It has meant from the first inefficiency, dishonesty, decreased production, increased cost of living, and is at the point of meaning outright bankruptcy. These circumstances have been aggravated by the fact that instead of devoting their energies chiefly to economic progress the Bolsheviks have adopted a more militaristic policy than ever did the Czar, and have made it their prime object to create a vast army for the conquest of the world. In this mad ambition they have hoped to be aided by the proletarian insurrections and strikes which their secret agents, supplied with stolen gold, have been endeavoring to foment in the United States and other countries. The question before the Powers is whether they shall give the Soviet infamy another lease of life, by entering into relations with it, or shall stand sternly aloof until through its own intrinsic rottenness the thing falls into merited dissolution and makes room for a decent democracy of the Russian people.

The suspension of five Socialist members of the New York State Assembly has been followed by their final expulsion from that body, and by the proposal to enact legislation which would debar them from reelection and would practically outlaw the Socialist party as at present constituted. Whatever may have been the deserts of the five men, there is no doubt that the weight of judicious opinion was against the action of the Assembly in expelling them. It was an inordinate straining of a Constitutional provision to hold that the Assembly had a right to consider their political opinions as "qualifications" for seats in that House upon which it was entitled to pass. On the same theory, a Democratic majority might expel Republicans. Beyond

question, a Prohibitionist majority might expel "wet" members, on the ground that they were opposed to an article of the Constitution and were therefore disqualified from taking the oath to support that instrument. Of course, if the political principles and purposes of these men were seditious or disloyal, they were unfit to serve. But sedition and treason are matters to be determined and dealt with by the courts of justice, and not by a committee of the State Assembly. The proposed anti-Socialist legislation is also a matter which should command the most thoughtful deliberation on both sides. We cannot tolerate having political liberty tampered with, even on the pretext of suppressing sedition. Neither, on the other hand, can we permit sedition to flourish under the pretext of political liberty. It is a time and a theme for heart-searching, for Socialists and Anti-Socialists alike.

It is a part of the irony of the present international situation that at the very time when a wise and patriotic campaign has been successfully conducted for the maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine, our relations with the States on whose account that Doctrine was enunciated should be made less satisfactory than they have been for many years. With Mexico we have, of course, long been at loggerheads. By our arbitrary and unsympathetic course, especially by compelling them to abandon their finely auspicious and beneficent International Court of Justice, we have alienated the Central American States and moved them to seek the formation of a new arbitral league from which we shall be excluded. We have been rebuffed from the exercise of any good offices for the settlement of the chief controversy which now vexes South America, one of the principal States of that continent somewhat curtly informing us that it needs and desires none of our meddling in its affairs. Yet a decade ago our relations with nearly all those countries were intimate and confident. Some day a philosophic historian may trace and analyze the connection between a persistent policy of antipathy toward the countries embraced in the principles of the Monroe Doctrine, and an attempt to betray, denounce and abrogate the Doctrine itself.

Daylight saving must now become a national issue. Since the unfortunate refusal of Congress to continue the salu-

tary system, chaos has prevailed. Some States have adopted the new system, and others have refused to do so. In some States local option on the subject prevails, each community determining for itself how it will set its clocks. Thus it may be noon in one city when it is eleven a. m. in the adjoining city. A railroad train may leave one station at noon and reach the next, a mile or two further on, at five minutes after eleven a. m. Some roads run some of their trains on the one and some on the other schedule, so that the five o'clock express and the six o'clock local leave the terminal at the same moment. Such confusion entails endless inconvenience and no little loss, and may at any time cause disaster. Its perpetuation would be intolerable. There must be a uniform national standard of time, and it will doubtless ultimately be that which best serves the convenience and economy of the greatest number of the people.

President Wilson declares that France is given over to militarism and imperialism, and is about as bad as Germany was at the beginning of the war; to which representative Frenchmen reply that America is governed by a madman. Mr. Lloyd George refuses to let the British Government cooperate with the French in compelling Germany to respect the Treaty of Versailles; and Frenchmen regard him as having betrayed them. Belgium sides with France, and Italy with Great Britain. In respect to Russian policy, and Turkish policy, and other matters of prime importance, there is no agreement among the Powers. In brief, the "Allied and Associated Powers" which two years ago were apparently on terms of perfect confidence and cooperation are now jarring and jangling and working at cross purposes. Such is the result of the insane attempt at "expecting all things in an hour" in the political, social and economic reorganization of the entire world as a prerequisite of peace, instead of rationally restoring peace first of all, and letting these other things await the orderly progress of events. The outlook would be disheartening and ominous beyond description if it were not for a cheerful confidence that the nations are wiser than the politicians, and are able to distinguish between speeches which are made for Buncombe and those which really voice the mind and the will of the people.